<center>**REMARKS**</center>

This is a response to the Office Action dated December 1, 2009. In this Office Action, the office rejected all pending claims. Herewith are presented amendments to the claims.

<center>**Amendment to Claim 30**</center>

Claim 30 is amended mirror the preamble in Claim 42 of *Ex parte Bo Li*, Appeal 2008-1213 (BPAI 2008). The Board held:

> "It has been the practice for a number of years that a "Beauregard Claim" of this nature be considered statutory at the USPTO as a product claim. (MPEP 2105.01, I). Though not finally adjudicated, this practice is not inconsistent with *In re Nuijten*. Further, the instant claim presents a number of software components, such as the claimed logic processing module, configuration file processing module, data organization module, and data display organization module, that are embodied upon a computer readable medium. This combination has been found statutory under the teachings of *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579 (Fed. Cir. 1994). In view of the totality of these precedents, we decline to support the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101."

No new matter is added as a result of this deletion. Examiner is respectfully requested to review and enter the amendment. This is believed to overcome a rejection under 35 USC § 101.

<center>**Amendment to Claim 1**</center>

The qualifier "optionally" is deleted from two phrases in Claim 1, making these elements required for the invention. No new matter is added as a result of this deletion. Examiner is respectfully requested to review and enter the amendment.

Claim 1 and other independent claims which depend from claim 1 are rejected over Kikinis are believed to be patentable because Claim 1 now requires the following features not present in Kikinis:

<center>14</center>

said client computer is adapted to transmit a signal to <u>an application discovery server in order to discover a desired client-side application</u>, said client-side application may be located on (or downloaded to) the server farm;

said client computer is adapted to <u>receive a signal from the discovered client-side application</u> (a) to <u>launch said discovered application</u>, or (b) to <u>connect to said discovered application</u>, or (c) to <u>reconnect to said discovered application</u>;

(Emphasis added). Kikinis does not disclose or claim any discovery of a client-side application on an application discovery server. Reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Response to Rejections of Claim 16 over Kikinis, USP 6,076,109

The office action rejected independent claim 16 as being disclosed in Kikinis. However, it is believed that Kikinis does not disclose or render obvious independent claim 16, which is principally directed toward a "compound request" message. The Office Action has once again relied on Kikinis, Col. 5, lines 34-44, for the proposition that Kikinis discloses all the necessary parts of claim 16. However, this appears to be an error. The video display circuitry 39 of Kikinis is undefined. One may at most infer from this name that this is a circuitry to display a video, which is, to be sure, a circular reasoning based on the name alone. The name alone does not describe any ability to receive a "compound request" message of the type disclosed and claimed in the instant claim 16.

Applicant has presented the argument to the Examiner in a prior response to the office action but it appears that this argument was not given due consideration. Kikinis does not disclose or claim at least the following features of claim 16.

second component coupled to the memory device, said <u>second component configured to receive a compound request message from the server wherein the compound request message comprises a cache of a plurality of events generated in a predetermined time period</u>;

15

third component coupled to the memory device, said third component

<u>configured to use the compound request message to update a display state of the</u>

<u>client computer</u>;

(Emphasis added). Nothing in the cited language or in Figure 2 of Kikinis is any mention of a "compound request" of the type disclosed and claimed in claim 16 as comprising "a cache of a plurality of events generated in a predetermined time period". Nor is there any mention of a "third component configured to use the compound request message to update a display state of the client computer" in Kikinis.

Kikinis discloses a "video circuitry 29" but this is not described in detail. Without a description of what goes into the "video circuitry 29", it is not logical to <u>infer</u> the existence of any and every feature thereafter invented. For example, a box in a document labeled "electronics" does not disclose or render obvious every electronic circuit thereafter invented. But such is the inference one must draw based on the office action's reliance on Kikinis for the features recited in claim 16. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims that depend from Claim 16 are believed to be patentable for the same reasons Claim 16 is believed to be patentable.

<div align="center"><u>**Independent Claim 30**</u></div>

Independent Claim 30 also recites the steps not present in Kikinis or any other reference that could be combined with Kikinis. For example, the following steps are not disclosed in Kikinis:

establishing a connection between a client computer and a discovery server;

discovering a desired application hosted on or downloadable to an execution server ("server farm");

To the extent Kikinis does not disclose a "discovery" server, or the step of discovering an application hosted on or downloadable to an execution server, the instant claim 30 is patentable over Kikinis. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

<div align="center">16</div>

<center>**Conclusion**</center>

All pending claims are believed to be patentable over the cited art. In light of the arguments, an early Notice of Allowance is requested. No fee is believed to be due with this response.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: August 29, 2010

S/Naren Chaganti (44,602)
Naren Chaganti
713 The Hamptons Lane,
Town & Country, MO 63017
(650) 248-7011 phone
Naren@Chaganti.com E-mail

Attorney for Applicant

<center>Certificate of Mailing or Electronic Filing</center>

I certify that on the date shown below I electronically filed the document via the PAIR system with the USPTO:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Naren Chaganti

Digitally signed by Naren Chaganti
DN: cn=Naren Chaganti, c=US, ou=Law
Offices, email=naren@chaganti.com
Reason: I am the author of this document
Date: 2010.08.29 17:57:54 -05'00'

Date: August 29, 2010

S/Naren Chaganti (44,602)
Naren Chaganti